

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
December 15, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group (LUWG) on December 15, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Proposed Resource Action Lists (Revised)
Attachment 4	Land Use Resource Action Matrix (Revised)

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the LUWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The LUWG reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – November 17, 2003 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the November 17, 2003 LUWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU80:** Review the Land Use resource action matrix against Butte County's resource action list for consistency (*carryover action item*).
- Status:** Rob MacKenzie (Butte County) stated that the County has reviewed its resource action list against an earlier version of the LUWG resource action matrix. He suggested that the County feels several resource actions are not represented accurately in the matrix. Details on proposed revisions to the resource action matrix are presented below.
- Action Item #LU90:** Discuss specific locations of dump areas referenced in LWG-3, including information known by DPR staff (supplemental action item to LU82).
- Status:** Jim Martin (DWR) informed the Work Group that DWR is continually learning about more dump areas (e.g., trash dumps, concrete debris piles, gravel, and driftwood) that are located in the project area. DWR will be taking a tour of the project area in January 2004 and will identify these dump areas on topographic maps; these maps will be provided to the PDEA Team. DPR staff indicated the need to coordinate with Roger Calloway (DPR) prior to the January field visit.
- Action Item #LU91:** Set up meeting between DWR and BLM regarding transfer of federal (BLM) lands within or near the project boundary (LWG-4).
- Status:** Jim Martin has talked with BLM staff regarding the proposed BLM land transfer, but no meeting has been formally arranged. DWR plans to meet DPR representatives prior to meeting with BLM. These meetings will likely take place in January/February 2004. The purpose of the meetings is to determine what information is needed to proceed with the transfer and who is responsible for the development of this information. It was noted that Native American tribes have also

filed for the subject BLM lands and would be next in line if the State fails to act on its filing.

Action Item #LU92: Consult with Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group regarding items included in LWG-20.

Status: Based on discussions in the LUWG regarding Action Item LU80, there was consensus that LWG-20 includes many separate proposals, making it difficult to assign to one work group or evaluate efficiently; Butte County agreed to re-write and re-submit LWG-20 as separate resource actions. These proposals would initially be evaluated by the LUWG because they mainly address land management issues however, some may ultimately be transferred to other work groups if appropriate. The LUWG determined that at this time it is not necessary to consult with the RSWG and this action item was deleted.

Study Implementation Update

Steve Pavich (EDAW) provided an update on all five Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics study plans to the LUWG as follows:

SP-L1 (Land Use)

The Draft Interim Report of L1 was distributed to the LUWG for review and comment. The report serves as a baseline report on land use and land ownership in the Project area. Comments on the Interim Report need to be submitted by or at the January 2004 LUWG meeting when the study will be discussed; all comments will be considered for inclusion in the final study report. Comments provided by agencies to date have not been included in the Interim Report. Steve noted that the Interim Report includes all maps except the land ownership map which is still being reviewed by DWR; this map will be included as part of the final report. The description of potential land use impacts/issues related to proposed resource actions will also be included in the final report. The LUWG should be able to review the final report in February or March 2004.

SP-L2 (Land Management)

The Draft Interim Report including a description of existing conditions and maps for L2 are currently being reviewed by DWR. The Interim Report will be presented and distributed to the LUWG at the January 2004 work group meeting. The consultant team is working on a description of potential land management impacts/issues related to proposed resource actions for the Final Report, which the LUWG will have the opportunity to review in February or March 2004.

SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency)

The Draft Interim Report of L3 has been reviewed by DWR and the LUWG. The consultant team is working on a description of the consistency of potential impacts/issues related to proposed resource actions in the context of land use-oriented plans. Jim Martin will coordinate with other RAMs who will describe consistency of potential impacts/issues related to proposed resource actions with non-land use plans. Consistency discussions will be included in the Draft Final Report, which is anticipated to be ready for LUWG review in February or March 2004.

SP-L4 (Aesthetics)

The consultant team expects to provide the Draft Final Report for L4 to DWR in January 2004. After DWR completes its review, the LUWG should be able to review the final report in March 2004.

SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management)

The Interim Report for L5 has been reviewed by DWR and the LUWG. The Draft Final Report will be submitted to DWR in December 2003. Steve reported there were very few comments on the Interim Report so the consultant team expects that the Interim and Final reports will be very similar. The final report will be available for review by the LUWG in January 2004.

Presentation of LULMA Recommended Resource Actions to Plenary Group

Jim Martin presented an overview of the presentation that he will be making at the Plenary Group in December 2003. The presentation provides an overview of the LUWG 's efforts to date, development and initiation of the study plans, the resource action development process including the preparation of resource action information forms, identification of those resource actions transferred to other work groups, recommended resource actions for Plenary Group and PDEA Team review, and the identification of potential cross-resource impacts associated with the recommended proposed resource actions. The LUWG discussed the need for a cross-resource task force to address cross-resource issues that are not handled by the various RAMS through their regular coordination efforts.

Review of Resource Action Lists and Matrix

The LUWG reviewed the revised proposed resource action lists (see Attachment 3) and resource action matrix (see Attachment 4). Proposed resource actions have been placed on either the 'A' list, which are proposed for further analysis; the 'B' list, which are not recommended for further analysis; the 'Settlement Issues' list, which are expected to be the subject of settlement negotiations, or on a list that identifies those proposed resource actions that have been transferred to other work groups for consideration. The Facilitator reminded the participants that any proposed resource action could be reconsidered and may move between lists as additional information is developed through the studies currently underway or through discussions at the settlement table.

Butte County suggested that LWG-20 is too narrow in scope and reiterated their desire for a comprehensive law enforcement analysis for the project area. Andy Atkinson (CDFG) noted that any such efforts in the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA) would need close coordination with CDFG. After further review of this resource action, the LUWG agreed that it includes several separate resource actions and Butte County agreed to re-write LWG-20, separating it into distinct proposals for reconsideration.

The LUWG discussed the proposal to re-water Ruddy Creek and the Facilitator summarized the Environmental Work Group 's (EWG) discussion on this proposed action. She explained that the EWG does not recommend the re-watering of Ruddy Creek for salmonid habitat and expressed concern with potential environmental health issues (mosquito control) associated with the proposal, but would not necessarily oppose the action if the LUWG recommended it be analyzed for aesthetic purposes. The EWG does not consider this to be a relicensing issue, and suggested that the project proponent investigate other methods to achieve the re-watering such as through the Urban Streams program but also noted that action would be difficult because the historic channel for Ruddy Creek is privately owned and there is no identified water source. Jim Martin agreed to speak to Terry Mills regarding this resource action in the context of aesthetics.

The LUWG discussed why LWG-23, the establishment of an oversight committee for the project, was moved to the Engineering & Operations Work Group (EOWG). The Facilitator explained that while this topic is typically a settlement issue and not subject to environmental analysis, an oversight committee is directly related to operation of the Project. She explained that in other recent relicensings, individual committees are developed to focus on specific issues and decision points needed during the term of the new license and the number of committees established in a new license are typically directly related to the amount of adaptive management or triggers for

action that are included in the license. She noted that other licensees have been sensitive to over-committing agencies to regular meetings unless a specific decision must be made.

The LUWG approved the proposed resource action recommendation presentation to the Plenary Group.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Monday, January 26, 2004
Time: 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
Location: Sacramento (videoconferencing will be available)

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and the due date.

Action Item #LU93: Re-write LWG-20 to separate into distinct resource action proposals.
Responsible: Rob MacKenzie (Butte County)
Due Date: January 26, 2004

Action Item #LU94: Discuss the proposal to re-water Ruddy Creek and associated land use issues with Terry Mills (EWG RAM).
Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: January 26, 2004

Action Item #LU95: Add Michael Pierce (Butte County) to LUWG mailing list.
Responsible: Facilitator
Due Date: January 26, 2004

Carryover Action Items:

Action Item #LU90: Discuss specific locations of dump areas referenced in LWG-3, including information known by DPR staff. Coordinate with Roger Calloway (DPR) prior to January field visit, and identify dump areas on map.
Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: January 26, 2004

Action Item #LU91: Set up meeting between DWR and BLM regarding transfer of federal (BLM) lands within or near the project boundary (LWG-4).
Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: January 26, 2004